

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

Total tax collections and selected Federal expenditures¹ by State, fiscal year, 1964

	Total tax collections	Total, selected Federal expenditures in the several States	Federal grants-in-aid payments to States	Federal wage and salary disbursements ²		Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefit payments	Veterans' compensation pensions and other benefits	Military prime contract awards
				Civilian	Military			
	Thousands			Millions	Millions	Thousands		Thousands
Alabama	\$726,075	\$1,331,850,373	\$248,820,168	\$425	\$125	\$221,258	\$121,091,205	\$190,681
Alaska	81,299	473,311,297	115,294,599	120	127	5,992	3,479,699	101,545
Arizona	427,550	885,921,395	111,514,580	142	95	107,333	56,248,845	173,825
Arkansas	358,881	606,628,441	175,749,730	94	70	145,354	91,793,711	29,731
California	10,534,708	11,205,196,424	1,153,938,266	1,735	1,351	1,335,117	529,494,158	5,100,650
Colorado	1,848,563	1,174,405,924	174,691,643	243	165	132,622	69,381,281	389,511
Connecticut	1,944,718	1,780,966,327	165,525,084	100	64	254,078	71,393,243	1,126,054
Delaware	950,032	170,054,134	28,418,109	23	38	36,713	23,499,025	80,424
District of Columbia	(3)	1,849,579,251	128,607,508	760	89	50,920	98,104,745	222,947
Florida	1,803,001	2,653,459,043	315,836,538	346	413	588,256	207,775,505	782,591
Georgia	1,415,391	1,961,112,382	293,108,938	374	397	242,032	134,892,444	520,109
Hawaii	293,453	521,876,023	64,220,557	160	203	32,070	10,473,466	52,112
Idaho	206,824	238,420,812	69,889,609	50	30	54,289	26,441,203	7,804
Illinois	8,697,901	3,098,710,769	560,979,891	626	257	936,143	289,396,878	429,201
Indiana	2,549,350	1,596,111,773	210,766,396	214	64	436,627	132,778,377	537,940
Iowa	856,388	776,317,558	166,231,434	120	23	265,920	94,774,124	103,042
Kansas	738,063	1,011,261,656	151,101,489	137	160	101,904	82,211,167	289,045
Kentucky	1,844,540	1,050,209,064	255,495,330	179	213	253,586	108,651,734	40,476
Louisiana	928,317	1,135,154,248	339,874,376	154	159	192,290	108,562,872	181,427
Maine	270,544	386,035,757	71,615,943	73	75	95,263	39,625,814	31,531
Maryland	2,629,382	2,367,573,970	176,460,024	1,049	291	212,781	90,396,946	547,936
Massachusetts	3,221,613	2,781,476,174	388,493,998	424	195	262,090	215,890,176	1,032,062
Michigan	9,382,587	2,415,609,770	451,258,275	292	144	721,139	215,922,495	591,290
Minnesota	1,764,467	1,114,524,289	249,706,495	163	42	304,454	136,422,794	217,941
Mississippi	342,933	767,391,825	172,086,580	105	178	134,272	82,122,245	155,911
Missouri	2,406,494	2,683,039,430	309,797,145	318	138	410,828	157,343,285	1,349,071
Montana	187,267	309,334,091	96,267,216	67	46	56,456	27,188,875	16,422
Nebraska	664,686	514,464,185	109,756,828	97	93	129,093	51,093,357	33,921
Nevada	240,646	172,470,612	51,612,364	46	37	20,204	11,293,248	6,361
New Hampshire	235,984	297,211,383	44,971,168	59	43	64,492	20,891,215	64,857
New Jersey	3,513,804	2,580,711,117	243,734,656	410	232	602,098	175,317,461	917,561
New Mexico	251,737	516,589,326	113,417,264	149	98	48,402	36,284,062	71,486
New York	20,167,510	7,068,803,614	898,372,065	1,157	291	1,699,775	526,218,549	2,496,438
North Carolina	2,738,295	1,502,262,459	242,900,027	355	285	299,505	146,341,432	273,416
North Dakota	134,035	445,414,683	93,942,801	39	48	49,646	22,800,882	192,025
Ohio	6,693,373	3,455,104,093	525,188,187	577	152	872,358	299,611,996	1,028,946
Oklahoma	1,091,472	1,107,733,505	264,303,896	279	155	190,824	96,156,609	122,489
Oregon	748,948	657,151,437	193,861,619	144	35	185,611	69,590,818	29,104
Pennsylvania	7,088,866	3,949,372,420	599,281,567	810	143	1,133,583	380,442,853	883,065
Rhode Island	469,582	408,547,637	68,576,536	81	99	90,093	31,705,001	38,173
South Carolina	489,959	773,735,221	125,082,042	153	233	140,977	70,055,179	51,621
South Dakota	152,889	287,511,731	86,105,261	55	32	58,198	32,900,350	23,308
Tennessee	1,041,970	1,211,518,445	273,890,896	255	99	251,085	138,978,549	193,564
Texas	4,240,209	4,419,557,112	607,347,891	774	792	621,988	329,790,721	1,294,431
Utah	324,575	753,431,890	104,336,695	101	25	59,322	34,033,195	340,040
Vermont	120,646	135,074,976	47,117,043	19	4	38,295	14,650,938	14,012
Virginia	1,823,564	2,949,892,457	238,980,230	1,036	587	262,936	134,124,227	590,852
Washington	1,882,842	2,266,086,070	243,269,980	321	245	262,936	105,398,990	1,085,696
West Virginia	398,255	669,177,732	131,628,368	65	13	185,386	86,836,364	87,327
Wisconsin	1,959,380	1,078,657,913	198,628,185	127	44	392,226	139,586,128	177,217
Wyoming	107,027	217,353,711	71,172,612	38	19	24,268	15,505,099	49,408
Total	4112,216,792	82,983,411,429	12,220,868,322	15,560	8,967	15,633,521	6,184,915,507	24,417,107

¹ This tabulation does not include all Federal expenditure programs carried on in the several States but is limited to those for which information is readily available on a State basis.

² Data are for the calendar year 1963.

³ Tax collections for the District of Columbia are included in the total for the State of Maryland.

⁴ Details do not add to total due to rounding.

Sources:

Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, August 1964, pp. 18-21.
Department of Defense, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Military Prime Contract Awards by State. Release of June 1964.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Bulletin, December 1964, p. 31.

Treasury Department, 1964 Annual Report, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1965, p. 73.

Treasury Department, preliminary tabulation to be included in the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1964, "Expenditures Made by the Government as Direct Payments to States Under Cooperative Arrangements and Expenditures Within States Which Provided Relief and Other Aid, Fiscal Year 1964."

Veterans' Administration, Annual Report, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, 1964, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1964, pp. 324-325.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I offer my amendment, I close my argument by saying to my good friend, the Senator from California, that I have no personal difference with him whatsoever. I do have a very emphatic professional difference with him this afternoon in regard to the merits of the position he is taking. I have a high regard for the dedication of the Senator from California to his duty as he sees that duty in connection with this bill.

Mr. President, I send to the desk my amendment, the controlling section of which I shall take a moment to read:

On page 2, after line 4, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 3. Sections 1 and 2 of this Act shall take effect upon the payment by the State of California to the Secretary of Commerce of an amount equal to 50 per centum of the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary of Commerce after appraisal, of the property interest of the United States to be released to the State of California by the first section of this Act."

Mr. President, after the Senator from California or anyone else makes such remarks as he cares to make, I shall ask for a quorum call—not a live quorum, but just long enough, let me say to my majority leader, who already has assured me that he will do what he can to help me obtain a ye and nay vote on my amendment, to obtain such a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 1, beginning with the comma, strike out all through the comma on line 2.

On page 2, after line 4, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 3. Sections 1 and 2 of this Act shall take effect upon the payment by the State of California to the Secretary of Commerce of an amount equal to 50 per centum of the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary of Commerce after appraisal, of the property interest of the United States to be

released to the State of California by the first section of this Act."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield before he suggests the call of the quorum?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon withhold his request?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Oregon is withdrawn and the Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as I tried to indicate earlier, any attempt to apply that kind of provision to this bill is both unwarranted and unreasonable, and as such, should be rejected by the Senate.

However, I do not rise at this time to further expatiate on that subject.

Let me say to my friend, the Senator from Oregon, that I placed a hold on his bill in order that I might study it at greater length. I have given this proposal careful consideration and have no objections to its passage. A time problem, however, has developed with numerous Senators attempting to return to the Capitol from various engagements downtown. It would therefore be appreciated if the distinguished Senator from Oregon would agree to temporarily set aside his amendment and place his bill on the calendar for the present consideration of the Senate. I am certain this could be arranged with the approval of the majority leader.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from California, but I would not want to do that. I would want my bill to take its course under the Unanimous Consent Calendar. The bill in no way violates the Morse formula, for reasons which I have already set forth. There is no Federal interest involved. Therefore, I would prefer to have the bill come up on the regular calendar and if any objection is raised I will discuss the objection at that time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as the call of the calendar is concerned, it would be in order at any time. If I may suggest, however, in view of the situation which has developed regarding some Senators who are now downtown on official engagements, would the Senator from Oregon consider the possibility of entering a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the Morse amendment at 2:15 o'clock p.m. and, in the meantime, take up the Johnson bill, S. 2602, which is on the calendar and ready for action?

Mr. MORSE. I would agree to a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at 2:15 o'clock p.m., but I would not want to take up the Johnson bill in the format of this discussion this afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. MORSE. I know. The Senator may not agree with me, but I think it could be very much misunderstood. The Johnson bill, so far as I am concerned, should stand on its own merits and I will defend it on its merits in regular consideration of the unanimous consent calendar, where the bill now is, and in due course of time the Senate will come to its consideration on that Unanimous Consent Calendar. I would not want my bill taken off that calendar by this procedure this afternoon. There are certainly other matters the Senate could discuss up until 2:15 o'clock p.m. Let me say to my majority leader that perhaps I could pay my respects to the war on Vietnam until that time. Perhaps we could use that time for that subject.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; there are other legislative measures which I would like the Senate to consider, if that would be agreeable to the Senator from Oregon. And I would like to include the Johnson bill in that program—I use the word

"Johnson" because I believe that is its popular name.

Mr. MORSE. That is right.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no objection to it, but I am more than willing to agree to the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon and take up afterward—

Mr. MORSE. Just put it down as a legislative eccentricity on my part. But, I would not want to have that bill taken off the calendar. I want it to go through its normal procedural rulings on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Both land bills could be taken up today. Therefore, I wish the Senator would reconsider. I do not make this request on the premise that there is a similarity between the bill now under consideration and the Johnson bill. I am confident we can reach an agreement and only ask the Senator to think it over.

Mr. MORSE. There is nothing to think over, so far as I am concerned. I hope that the majority leader will not press the Johnson bill today—in any event, not take up the Johnson bill until some other intervening legislation is passed by the Senate.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. All right, that is agreeable and will be worked out. In view of the seeming assent of the two Senators, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending Morse amendment be held at 2:15 o'clock p.m.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not object—let me ask the majority leader and the Senator from Oregon, would they be inclined to agree to a unanimous-consent agreement for a yea-and-nay vote, which has not yet been ordered—but I commit myself to it—would they be agreeable to having a yea-and-nay vote on the pending amendment to commence at 2:20 p.m., to be followed immediately thereafter by a vote on final passage?

Mr. MORSE. That would be perfectly all right.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. KUCHEL. That would give a little time for Senators to return to the Capitol from downtown.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well, Mr. President, I amend my request in the sense stated by the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that rule XII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to, and rule XII is waived.

DOGS AND CATS USED IN RESEARCH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1246, H.R. 13881.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13881) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in order to protect the owners of dogs and cats from theft of such pets, to prevent the sale or use of dogs and cats which have been stolen, and to insure that certain animals intended for use in research facilities are provided humane care and treatment, it is essential to regulate the transportation, purchase, sale, housing, care, handling and treatment of such animals by persons or organizations engaged in using them for research or experimental purposes or in transporting, buying, or selling them for such use.

SEC. 2. When used in this Act—

(a) The term "person" includes any individual, partnership, association, or corporation;

(b) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture;

(c) The term "commerce" means commerce between any State, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State, territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, but through any place outside thereof; or within any territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

(d) The term "cat" means any live cat (*Felis catus*);

(e) The term "dog" means any live dog (*Canis familiaris*);

(f) The term "research facility" means any school, institution, organization, or person that uses or intends to use dogs or cats in research, tests, or experiments, and that (1) purchases or transports dogs or cats in commerce, or (2) receives funds under a grant, award, loan, or contract from a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States for the purpose of carrying out research, tests, or experiments;

(g) The term "dealer" means any person who, regularly and for profit, transports, except as a common carrier, or buys and sells animals intended for use in research facilities;

(h) the term "animal" means live dogs, cats, monkeys (nonhuman primate mammals), guinea pigs (*Cavia cobaya*), hamsters (*Cricetus*), and rabbits (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*).

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any research facility to purchase animals from any dealer unless such dealer holds a valid license issued by the Secretary pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any dealer to buy, sell, offer to buy or sell, transport or offer for transportation in commerce any animal unless such dealer has obtained a license from the Secretary in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe pursuant to this Act, and such license has not been suspended or revoked.

SEC. 5. No department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States which uses

animals for research or experimentation shall purchase or otherwise acquire animals for such purposes from any dealer unless such dealer holds a valid license issued by the Secretary pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 6. Every research facility shall register with the Secretary in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

SEC. 7. The Secretary shall establish and promulgate standards to govern the humane handling, care, treatment, and transportation of animals by dealers and research facilities. Such standards shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, minimum requirements with respect to the housing, feeding, watering, sanitation, ventilation, shelter from extremes of weather and temperature, separation by species, and adequate veterinary care. The foregoing shall not be construed as authorizing the Secretary to prescribe standards for the handling, care, or treatment of animals during actual research or experimentation by a research facility as determined by such research facility.

SEC. 8. Any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States having laboratory animal facilities shall comply with the standards promulgated by the Secretary for a research facility under section 7.

SEC. 9. All dogs and cats delivered for transportation, transported, purchased, or sold in commerce by any dealer shall be marked or identified in such humane manner as the Secretary may prescribe.

SEC. 10. Research facilities and dealers shall make, and retain for such reasonable period of time as the Secretary may prescribe, such records with respect to the purchase, sale, transportation, identification, and previous ownership of dogs and cats as the Secretary may prescribe, upon forms supplied by the Secretary. Such records shall be made available at all reasonable times for inspection by the Secretary, by any Federal officer or employee designated by the Secretary.

SEC. 11. The Secretary shall issue a license to any dealer upon application therefor and payment of the license fee prescribed pursuant to section 23 of this Act if the Secretary determines that the facilities of such dealer comply with the standards prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to section 7 of this Act. The Secretary may license as a dealer any person who is not a dealer within the meaning of section 2(g) of this Act, upon application and payment of the prescribed fee, if such person enters into a written agreement with the Secretary under which such person agrees to comply with the requirements of this Act and the regulations prescribed hereunder.

SEC. 12. The Secretary shall make such investigations or inspections as he deems necessary to determine whether any person has violated or is violating any provision of this Act or any regulation issued thereunder. The Secretary shall promulgate such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to permit inspectors to confiscate or destroy in a humane manner any animals found to be suffering as a result of a failure to comply with any provision of this Act or any regulation issued thereunder if (1) such animals are held by a dealer, or (2) such animals are held by a research facility and are no longer required by such research facility to carry out the research, test, or experiment for which such animals have been utilized.

SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary shall consult and cooperate with other Federal departments, agencies, or instrumentalities concerned with the welfare of animals used for research or experimentation when establishing standards pursuant to section 7 and in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(b) The Secretary shall take such action as he may deem appropriate to encourage the various States of the United States to adopt such laws and to take such action as will promote and effectuate the purposes of

this Act, and the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the officials of the various States in effectuating the purposes of this Act and any State legislation on the same subject.

SEC. 14. No dealer shall sell or otherwise dispose of any dog or cat within a period of five business days after the acquisition of such animal, except pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

SEC. 15. The Secretary shall issue rules and regulations requiring licensed dealers and research facilities to permit inspection of their premises and records at reasonable hours upon request by legally constituted law enforcement agencies in search of lost animals.

SEC. 16. No dog or cat may be sold or offered for sale in commerce at a public auction or by weight, and no research facility may purchase a dog or cat at a public auction or by weight, unless the sale or offer for sale of such animal is made (1) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, and (2) by a dealer licensed under this Act.

SEC. 17. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary to promulgate rules, regulations, or orders for the handling, care, treatment, or inspection of animals during actual research or experimentation by a research facility as determined by such research facility.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to promulgate such additional standards, rules, regulations, and orders as he may deem necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 18. Any dealer who violates any provision of this Act shall, on conviction thereof, be subject to imprisonment for not more than one year or a fine of not more than \$1,000, or both.

SEC. 19. (a) If the Secretary has reason to believe that a dealer or any person licensed as a dealer has violated or is violating any provision of this Act or any rule or regulation prescribed hereunder, he may suspend such person's license temporarily, but not to exceed thirty days, and, after notice and opportunity for hearing, may revoke or suspend such license for such additional period as he may specify if such violation has occurred, and may order such person to cease and desist from continuing such violation.

(b) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Secretary issued pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may, within sixty days after entry of such an order, seek review of such order in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1009).

SEC. 20. Whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that any research facility has violated or is violating any provision of this Act or any rule or regulation prescribed thereunder, he shall cause a complaint in writing to be delivered to such research facility, describing the alleged violation or violations. If the Secretary, after the expiration of twenty days following the day on which the complaint was delivered to such research facility, has reason to believe that such research facility is continuing to violate the provisions of this Act, or any rule or regulation prescribed thereunder, as described in the complaint, he shall apply to the district court for the district in which such research facility is located for a court order directing such research facility to cease and desist from committing the violations described in the Secretary's complaint.

SEC. 21. When construing or enforcing the provisions of this Act, any act, omission, or failure of any individual, while acting within the scope of his office or employment for a dealer, shall be deemed to be the act, omission, or failure of such dealer as well as of such individual.

SEC. 22. If any provision of this Act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held in-

valid, the remainder of this Act and the application of any such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 23. The Secretary is authorized to charge, assess, and cause to be collected reasonable fees for licenses issued to dealers. All such fees shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 24. The regulations referred to in section 7 and section 10 shall be prescribed by the Secretary as soon as reasonable but not later than six months from the date of enactment of this Act. Additions and amendments thereto may be prescribed from time to time as may be necessary or advisable. Compliance by dealers with the provisions of this Act and such regulations shall commence ninety days after the promulgation of such regulations. Compliance by research facilities with the provisions of this Act and such regulations shall commence six months after the promulgation of such regulations, except that the Secretary may grant extensions of time to research facilities which do not comply with the standards prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to section 7 of this Act provided that the Secretary determines that there is evidence that the research facilities will meet such standards within a reasonable time.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say that at 2:20 the Senate will return to the business which has just been laid aside temporarily, the Morse amendment.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Morse amendment, which will be voted on at 2:20.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to the bill H.R. 13881, reported by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, as amended by the committee.

This bill is generally known as the Humane Act for the Handling of Research Animals.

I think, after nearly half a century of failing to note the plight of animals who serve humanity so well in research and who have helped bring us forward in the frontiers of medical science, it is high time Congress addressed itself to the correction of these unnecessary and inhumane conditions.

The bill, which has been carefully studied and amended a great many times, strikes first at the source of supply for laboratory animals in seeking to eliminate the theft of household pets, dogs and cats, and to put restrictions on dealers who sell animals for research purposes.

There have been many exposes, by some of our finest magazines and newspapers, regarding the well-organized theft of animals from homes and from farms, collecting them in secret places, and shipping them out in illicit and clandestine interstate commerce to other

States, where they then find their way, presumably, into the research facilities.

I think the sections of the bill which deal with the transportation, the sale, and the handling of these dogs and cats by such dealers can most effectively be carried out and in fact can only be carried out by the Federal Government, because the ease with which they can be put in trucks and shipped across State lines overnight takes them far away from their homes and far away from the possibility of identification by the owners who would be searching for them.

The purposes of the bill, I think, are clearly set out in the report, which places under the Secretary of Agriculture the operations of the bill, and which—

(1) Requires the licensing of animal dealers by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) Makes it unlawful for a research facility to purchase animals from any dealer unless the dealer has been licensed.

(3) Requires research facilities to register with the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) Directs the Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate regulations after consultation with other Federal agencies to insure—

(a) The humane handling, care, treatment, and transportation of animals by dealers and research facilities except during actual research or experimentation as determined by a research facility;

(b) That dogs and cats are marked or identified in a humane manner;

(c) That research facilities and dealers make and retain records of their purchase and sale of dogs and cats;

(d) That licensed dealers and research facilities permit inspection of their facilities by legally constituted law enforcement agencies in search of lost animals;

(e) That dogs and cats are humanely treated during auction sale; and

(f) That inspectors will be able to confiscate or destroy dealer-held and postresearch animals found suffering because of violations of the act.

(5) —

And this is the point, I think, in greatest controversy—

Directs the Secretary of Agriculture to make inspections to determine whether dealers and research facilities are complying with the act.

The enforcement of the provisions of the bill, particularly with respect to dealers and research facilities, in prescribing humane conditions under which the animals must be cared for, rests with the Secretary of Agriculture. Some have urged that enforcement be placed with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The bill further—

(6) Provides a criminal penalty for violation of the act by dealers and suspension or revocation of a dealer's license for violations of the act or regulations issued thereunder with the right of review in the proper district court.

Research institutions, because of their high standing and their important leadership in medical research, are treated entirely differently. In the case of such institutions, the bill merely provides that in cases of violation by research facilities, after having been warned over a period of 20 days, the Secretary, upon failing to receive voluntary compliance

with an order for humane care, can apply to the appropriate district court for a cease and desist order.

Twice in the bill it is pointed out specifically that there can be no interference by the Secretary of Agriculture, in enforcement, with any type of research facility whatsoever, in its actual research on the animal, either preoperative or postoperative.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to my fellow member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. First of all, Mr. President, I should like to compliment the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for the yeoman work he has done on this legislation.

I agree with the spirit and the purpose of the bill 100 percent. Yes, the time has come when something affirmative must be done to insure the treatment of research animals in a humane manner.

Personally, I am a dog lover. We have always had a dog in our family, and our family dog has always been very dear to all of us. I think it is disgraceful, in this enlightened age, that people should treat animals in some of the ways of which experience has indicated they are capable.

My feelings are shared by the legion of pet-owners in my State of Rhode Island and in the sincerest letters they have made their views known to me.

The other day, Dr. Shannon, the distinguished head of our National Institutes of Health visited me at the office. He is very much in favor of this legislation exactly as it is. His only expressed fear was that because the rehabilitation of animal care facilities usually is not as dramatic as some of the other items upon which we have been spending our money, there has been a reluctance to use any funds for that purpose.

Realizing that, the committee wrote into the bill a provision that insofar as research facilities are concerned, they would have a reasonable opportunity to meet the requirements of the law. Am I not correct in that?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is absolutely correct, and we would anticipate a moving forward on a gradual basis, so that research institutions would not be required or expected to obtain complete new animal care facilities within a period of 30 or 60 days. We do wish to see the facilities they have cleaned up and improved.

We felt the Secretary of Agriculture could administer this, and then we provided for the grants of which the Senator is well aware, having served so faithfully on the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], whereby research facilities could obtain the 50-50 fund matching that is available for the improvement of animal quarters.

Mr. PASTORE. On that point—and I agree implicitly with the Senator from Oklahoma—Dr. Shannon intimated that possibly we should review the formula

of 50-50 fund matching. There may be cases, he thought, where we could speed up the modernization of such facilities if we took into account the fact that some such establishments do not have the money available to match, and that a more favorable formula might be devised.

I realize we cannot write this contingency into this bill, and he does not pretend for one moment that we should. But I should like to ask the Senator whether or not he would be amenable to such an idea.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would not only be amenable, I would be happy to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island and the dozens of other Senators who would like to see this matching made greater, and expedited in sums sufficient to correct the situations in the roughly 2,000 research laboratories that would be primarily affected by the bill.

We think it is penny-wise and pound foolish to appropriate \$1,900 million for medical research facilities and for medical research, and to be penurious on the care of the research animals.

Mr. PASTORE. Without which you cannot have the research.

Mr. MONRONEY. Without which we could not have research in the first place; that is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. I congratulate my fellow Senator. I say again, he has done a magnificent job on this measure. He is to be congratulated, and I hope the bill will pass by an overwhelming vote. As a matter of fact, I hope it will pass without a dissenting vote.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. We appreciate the support of Dr. Shannon.

We felt that when it was understood what the bill as amended provides, there could be no objection from the research fraternity, which is doing so great a work throughout the country.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, who has fought for so long for the very helpful legislation that we hope will be passed in the current session of Congress.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I congratulate the chairman of the Commerce Committee, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator in charge of the bill, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for the splendid work that they have done in reporting the bill dealing with the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation.

The background of need for this legislation is well set forth in the committee report which begins at the top of page 5.

I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the report beginning at the top of page 5 and ending immediately before the section-by-section analysis may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the portion of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

This bill recognizes the need for Federal legislation to deal with the abuses that have developed as a result of the Nation's vast program of medical research. Much of this medical research involves experiments and tests with animals. The demand for research animals has risen to such proportions that a system of unregulated dealers is now supplying hundreds of thousands of dogs, cats, and other animals to research facilities each year.

The committee held 3 days of hearings on the subject of regulating those who sell, transport, or handle animals intended for use in medical research. During these hearings, shocking testimony was received concerning the existence of pet stealing operations which supply some animals eventually used by many research institutions. Stolen pets are quickly transported across State lines, changing hands rapidly, and often passing through animal auctions. While in the hands of dealers, these animals are faced with inhumane conditions. Quarters are cramped, uncomfortable, and unsanitary, with inadequate provisions for food and water.

The public has been aroused by exposés of pet theft and the treatment encountered by many of these animals on their way to the medical laboratory. Yet, State laws have proved inadequate both in the apprehending and conviction of the thieves who operate in this interstate operation, and in providing for adequate conditions within dealer premises.

Much of the responsibility for creating this huge demand for medical research animals rests with the Federal Government. Grants to research institutions for biomedical research have multiplied twelve-fold since the early 1950's. H.R. 13881 provides a mechanism that will block the existing interstate trade in stolen pets and at the same time will insure humane treatment of those animals which are destined for use in research facilities.

However, it is not just the animal on the way to the laboratory that is faced with inadequate care and treatment. The committee hearings disclosed that shortcomings existed in the care and housing that animals receive after arriving in many medical research laboratories. Cramped quarters and inadequate care are often present, especially in the older research institutions.

H.R. 13881 as amended by the committee also recognizes the need for upgrading animal standards in the laboratory, but at the same time provides adequate safeguards to insure that medical research will not be impaired. While all witnesses before the committee recognized the need for improving care and housing in the research laboratory, contradictory testimony was received on the question of whether this problem was a responsibility for the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. After lengthy consideration, including an extra day of hearings on the specific issue, it was the committee's determination that the Department of Agriculture was the proper agency for regulating care and housing in the laboratory. However, the committee was very careful to provide protection for the research in this matter of exempting from regulation all animals during actual research or experimentation, as opposed to the pre- and post-research treatment. It is not the intention of the committee to interfere in any way with research or experimentation.

The medical research community was unanimous in its position that additional funds might be needed in order for many research facilities to meet desirable standards in their animal care facilities. The committee took cognizance of this situation by providing that the Secretary may grant extensions of time for compliance by research fa-

cilities beyond the 6-month compliance time in the bill, provided that the research facility can comply within a reasonable time.

The bill does not provide for any additional Federal funds for laboratory animal care facilities. It is hoped that the appropriate committees in the Congress will be able to consider the desirability of additional aid to research facilities for animal quarters in the future.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, for several years under the pressure of—and I use that word advisedly and in the best possible sense—a number of splendid women, including wives of Members of this splendid body, it has been my pleasure to introduce and pursue to enactment legislation which would deal with the really shocking conditions which exist with respect to the handling of animals.

A bill is presently pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which is sponsored by me and cosponsored by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. That bill was originally also cosponsored by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. I regret that she saw fit at a later date to remove her endorsement.

That bill would deal across the board with the basic and fundamental problems of animal care in connection with research.

May I state very clearly that nobody who supported either that bill or this bill can legitimately be classified as an antivivisectionist. We all appreciate the need for medical research, research in biology, and in chemistry, and the existing need to use animals in connection with medical training if the pursuit of knowledge is to be successfully carried on.

That is no reason that these animals should be treated cruelly and inhumanely during the period of time in which they are awaiting experimentation or, even though the bill does not call for it, once the experimentation is completed.

An incident which occurred in Slatington, Pa., a year or two ago in which a pet poodle of a member of the local power structure was stolen by an animal dealer, transported to New York, placed in a hospital, and killed as a result of the research experiments before the owner of the dog could discover what had happened to his dog, induced me to introduce legislation which in principle is identical with the bill now before us.

I found present in the Senate Chamber that same day the able senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who was in the process of introducing a similar bill. We coordinated our efforts and combined our activities. The bill which is now reported and being acted on by the Senate is the result of that activity.

I note that my colleague, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, is present in the Chamber. He also introduced a bill along the same lines, making his contribution to the final effort in which we are now engaged.

I thank my friend, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, for his courtesy in yielding, and I indicate my very strong support for the legislation and hope that it might be promptly passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his pioneering work and for his great drive in assisting the crusade for corrective legislation.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania and to thank him for his continuing interest evidenced by the introduction of his legislation, his sponsorship of the pending matter, and the very active part he has taken on the Committee on Commerce in helping to work out a compromise and bring it to the floor.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am most grateful to my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma.

I favor H.R. 13881 wholeheartedly. We of the Committee on Commerce have worked out the best possible bill in my opinion. It was essential to move to cure the evils which have pervaded so many American neighborhoods in which dogs and cats have been stolen and brutally and savagely treated and kept under cruel and inhumane conditions.

In order to accomplish our purpose, we were careful not to interfere with the legitimate research activities involving the use of animals in research by properly authorized and suitably inspected hospitals and other medical research agencies.

My own bill, S. 3059, was quite similar to the bill finally reported. Some of the provisions of my bill are included in the pending measure.

I am well satisfied with the final product.

I appreciate the references to my bill by my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

This legislation is in the public interest. It should bring some comfort to people who own and love their pets.

I am very happy to support the measure. I thank the senior Senator from Oklahoma for yielding to me.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understood that the Department of Agriculture had some objections to the original bill. They objected because the inspection of the animals and the records to be kept was to be done by the animal handlers and not by those people who actually used the animals.

Do I correctly understand that the bill has been amended to provide that the records will be kept not only by those people who handle the animals, but also by those who use them?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct, and by those who buy the animals from the dealers. A mark of identification will be placed upon the animals, and the records of the care of the animals and everything related to the research facility is the problem of the research facility.

Mr. ELLENDER. The department would have to look for a record to those who handle the animals and to those who use them.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. A fee is to be charged for the license. We expect to provide adequate

funds for the Department of Agriculture to carry on the inspection work which is to be carried on under the act with relation to both the animals and the research quarters in which the animals are kept.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the fees be sufficient to take care of the cost of operating the program?

Mr. MONRONEY. We believe that the program will require an expenditure of approximately \$2 million a year total to enforce the legislation. Certainly the Department of Agriculture is eligible for appropriations for this purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the fees be deposited in the Treasury?

Mr. MONRONEY. License fees collected under the act would decrease, to some extent, the future cost to the Government. It would revert to the Treasury under the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the bill actually provides that the fees and charges would go to the Treasury.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

(At this point, Mr. PASTORE assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, for many years, several of us have been sponsoring legislation to provide uniform Federal standards for the humane care and treatment of animals used in medical research. In previous Congresses the reaction of the organized medical research community was completely negative. The National Society for Medical Research rejected out of hand any suggestion that there was a need for Federal legislation. All those who proposed such measures were branded as antivivisectionists or well-intentioned but ill informed. Either way, it was claimed that the result of Federal legislation would be disastrous to medical research. The care and treatment of animals in the laboratories was adequate already; no Federal involvement was necessary or desirable. This concern by the medical researchers that the proposed remedy was worse than the disease was legitimate as it applied to some of the legislation introduced through the years. But to deny that inhumane or substandard conditions existed in animal research laboratories was, to put it mildly, less than candid; or to suggest that the Federal Government, with its enormous financial investment in research, has no legitimate interest in humane care is ludicrous.

In the 89th Congress, the NSMR decided to reverse a long standing policy and to support Federal legislation. This measure was introduced by Congressman ROYBAL in the other body. The Roybal bill was long on money but short on standards. All other proposals before Congress were roundly condemned as restrictive of medical research, with the exception of my own bill, S. 1087, which was singularly described as both helpful and backward.

With this long history of opposition to any Federal legislation in the area of humane animal care in research laboratories, I find it difficult to work up much

sympathy for those doctors who bemoan the passage of the measure before us today and who urge support for the bill drafted by the National Institutes of Health, which was recently introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee [Mr. CLARK]. If the medical community had supported rather than fought legislation in past years, it could have had money and trained personnel years ago. It gets neither in this bill, and what it does get are administrative problems that may cause nightmares for several years.

By denying categorically over the years in intemperate language that any problems existed in the laboratories, the doctors forfeited their bargaining position in the legislative process.

Their "thou shalt not pass" attitude taken on medicare is another case in point, of what happens when those most affected by proposed legislation refuse to cooperate and compromise with Congress.

With that said, I want to turn to some serious problems which exist in the pending legislation, H.R. 13881. When this bill came to the Senate from the other House it was strictly an animal dealer measure. It established humane standards for the care and handling by commercial dealers of certain animals to be used in medical research. In the Senate, however, the coverage was expanded to include research facilities. The reason for research facilities being included in this bill from the Commerce Committee is directly related to the history of animal care legislation which I have just related.

The medical research animal care legislation introduced into Congress in the past has been referred to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Due primarily to the adamant opposition of medical opinion to legislation in this area, that committee has not taken any action on the bills. Therefore, when the animal dealer bill came to the Commerce Committee, it appeared to some supporters of humane care legislation to provide an ideal opportunity to get Senate action, after years of frustration, by amending the dealer bill which was before a committee which might be more receptive than the Labor and Public Welfare Committee had ever been.

It is interesting to note here that the only support for this approach from the organized humane movement came from the Society for Animal Protective Legislation. The much larger Humane Society of the United States, the American Humane Society, and the Catholic Animal Protection League all opposed the inclusion of research facilities in the pending legislation. These latter groups took their position on the grounds that the Labor and Public Welfare Committee was at long last ready to hold extensive public hearings on the various humane care bills before it and that the resulting bill would be much more comprehensive and effective than the amended Commerce Committee version. The medical community also opposed the Commerce Committee amended bill on the grounds that the NIH bill before the Labor and

Public Welfare Committee met the needs of humane animal care much more adequately. The Commerce Committee rejected these appeals from the national humane societies and the medical researchers, deciding to include research facilities in the bill, presumably on the theory that a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.

It being agreed then that humane standards ought to be established for research facilities, who should draw them up and administer them? The alternatives before the committee were the Agriculture Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Agriculture was charged with setting up the standards in the bill for the dealers, so it was natural that its authority should be extended to cover research facilities. On the other hand, it was medical research which was being conducted on the animals, so HEW was also a natural agency to which to turn. The Department of Agriculture made very clear to the committee in both correspondence and in testimony that it did not want the responsibility of administering standards of animal care in research facilities, and itself suggested that HEW was the more appropriate department.

The committee, however, decided in favor of Agriculture. It did so for two reasons. One was that giving the administration of standard setting and investigation over to medical people in HEW to apply to medical research facilities smacked of self-regulation. Self-regulation in the abuse of animals was considered inappropriate by the committee.

Secondly, the committee decided that the standards for humane care in research facilities would apply only to pre- and post-experiment situations, not when the animals were in experimentation. The committee report and the explicit language of the bill make it very clear that it is not the intention of the committee to interfere in any way with medical experimentation. This assumption of the committee that animal care can be separated from animal experimentation was then used to justify giving Agriculture the administrative responsibilities in the bill. Everyone agreed that Agriculture employees were not qualified to make decisions about animals in experimentation. But the committee decided that the standards would apply only before and after experimentation, and at those times the Agriculture employees were certainly capable of making intelligent decisions.

Unfortunately, neither rationale just mentioned is satisfactory. In the first place the refusal to trust doctors to regulate animal facilities seems a bit silly when we allow those same doctors self-regulation in the accreditation of our hospitals which take care of human ills. On the basis of experience, rapport, and administrative efficiency and cost the HEW would appear to be the logical agency to handle a program affecting medical research laboratories.

The second assumption, though, is even less warranted. Animal care facilities cannot be separated under the definitions of this bill from animal experiment facilities. In most research

facilities covered by this bill there are no animal care quarters separate from the plant where the experimentation takes place for guinea pigs, hamsters, rabbits, and cats. In some laboratories this is also true of dogs. These animals enter experimentation as soon as they arrive in the research facility and therefore would be outside the regulating authority of the Secretary, if the research facilities so determine.

This situation is unfair to everyone. It places the researcher in a position of interpreting the explicit language of sections 7 and 17(a) in such a way that no Federal standards would apply if he wants it that way. It means that the humane groups will charge bad faith. It means that the Agriculture Department is in the most unenviable position of having to make some decisions that only Solomon could tackle. The only way to avoid this administrative mess is to amend the bill so that HEW administers the standards. Then sections 7 and 17(a) could be amended as well. But I see no realistic chance of such an amendment being carried. I want to go on record as having great sympathy for all who will be concerned with the administration and enforcement of this bill, as I see nothing but trouble.

Its intent is good but it is what I consider rather poor legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Unlock the Doors," published in the bulletin of the National Society for Medical Research, January-February 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the bulletin of the National Society for Medical Research, January-February, 1966]

UNLOCK THE DOORS

(By Ken Niehans)

The University of Oregon Medical School has gone a step farther than unlocking the doors. The doors to the animal facilities have no locks.

Discussion of the use of animals in medical research has traditionally been a taboo topic in most institutional public information programs. This was true at Oregon Medical School until a little over two years ago when this tradition was tossed out. An about face was made.

It was the director of animal care, Allan Rogers, and the clinical veterinarian, Dr. Leroy Erickson, who nudged school authorities into starting a public education program concerning animal care and animals in research. Assistant Dean Joe Adams, Rogers, Erickson and Ken Niehans got together to talk over some of the problems facing the animal care department. An antivivisectionist city ordinance made animals unavailable locally. Another problem was recruitment of qualified animal caretakers and educating them about the function of good animal care in successful investigative programs.

Both Rogers and Erickson, who hold full-time faculty positions at the medical school, base their animal-care philosophy on the principle that animals must be given care effectively similar to that of human patients. It was felt that if by word and deed we could show the public this philosophy at work, we could gain support for our program.

There was nothing to hide. Our animals were extremely well cared for. So it was decided not only to establish an "open door" policy but to present to the public, through various news media, information about how animals are used in medical research, how they are cared for and their contribution to medical science.

Shortly after deciding to initiate an information campaign, the Medical Research Foundation of Oregon purchased a 180-acre farm for the medical school to use in breeding and housing animals. This purchase gave an excellent starting point for the information program. Families on neighboring farms and ranches were visited and informed as to the type of facility the farm would be. A caretaker was hired from the area. He knew everyone nearby, and was well liked.

News stories about the farm and plans for its use were prepared in the Public Affairs Office. These were sent to newspapers, radio and television stations. When new animals arrived at the farm they were photographed and the pictures were provided to the news media.

During this developmental period the new nine-story research building was under construction. The first two floors of the new building are devoted to animal quarters, experimental animal surgery, the animal morgue, cage washing facilities, etc.

In December 1962, following a preview for the press, an open house for the public was held. One of the most popular areas, visited by several thousand persons, was the experimental animal surgery suite, where, with the use of department-store mannequins, a very authentic mock animal-surgery setup was presented. A member of the animal care department was on hand to answer questions and explain the use of the various pieces of equipment.

Science stories released to the news media included information on the use of animals. When Dr. Erickson, the school's first full-time veterinarian was appointed to the faculty, brief announcements were sent to the newspapers. Later these were followed with a feature story in our school publication which goes to all the news media and "thought leaders" throughout the state, as well as to the employees and faculty of the medical school.

The program appeared to have gained acceptance from the local animal humane groups. The way seemed to have been paved for a more direct approach. A local medical reporter was approached regarding a story on our animal care department and our animal breeding program. He accepted the idea enthusiastically. A full picture page appeared in the press along with the story about the animals at the school, the farm, and about our dog breeding program.

A few days later, quite by accident, an incident happened which gave an excellent opportunity to get research animals into the news again. One of the goats in which an artificial aorta had been implanted was being brought in from the farm for a checkup by the surgeon. In the act of being unloaded at the medical school, he jumped out of the pick-up truck and literally went "over the hill" into the forested area which surrounds the school. An extensive search failed to turn up the evasive animal. The surgeon, of course, was very anxious to get him back as he was important to the investigator's evaluation of the artificial aorta and the method of implantation.

We called the newspapers, radio and television stations and asked them to help us find the lost goat. The papers all ran stories about him, radio stations mentioned him daily on their newscasts and TV stations asked their viewers to keep on the lookout for the white goat, which by this time had been named "Barney" by a local reporter.

Bartley remained lost for 10 days before a filling-station attendant spotted him high on one of the hills in Jackson Park. Finding him led to more stories in the press, again informing the public about research animals.

It was then decided the time was right—and the public ready—for a television documentary on animals in research. Scouting around produced a perfect star for the show, a black and tan mongrel dog at the farm which had been used in the open-heart surgery program. For supporting actors Rogers, Dr. Erickson, Dr. John Brookhart, chairman of the medical school's research committee and Dr. William Fletcher, a young surgeon on our staff were used. But the real star of the TV show was the mongrel dog named Duke.

Thanks to the kennel manager Vic Reynolds, in a matter of a week Duke was trained to make his entrance on cue, and sit in a chair just like the other members of the panel. The show was called "Animal, Soldiers in Research."

To promote viewing of the documentary, post cards were printed with Duke's picture on them and sent to kennel owners, humane groups, legislators and community thought leaders. No punches were pulled in showing and speaking the truth on this show. (A copy of the film is available for loan from the National Society for Medical Research.)

It must be admitted that there was much speculation whether the switchboard would be flooded with calls after the broadcast. Concern proved to be unwarranted. Not a single objection to the program was received by either the school or by KGW, the NBC-affiliate station which telecast the show.

Duke, the canine star, who had contributed so much to the school's heart surgery program was later nominated and named National Research Dog Hero of the Year. Perhaps you already know about the rather elaborate press conference that was held for the dog, resulting in front-page newspaper picture stories in most of the major cities in the country and television broadcasts to an estimate 160 million viewers in and beyond the United States.

Those who have been through a formal press conference, facing dozens of reporters and a battery of cameras will agree that for this alone Duke deserved retirement—not to mention his contributions to medicine. Duke was presented to a 6-year old boy who had had the same type of surgery as the dog, and today Duke is enjoying life with his beneficiary and his family on a large farm near Portland.

It seemed extremely important to direct some of our efforts in this information program to youngsters. Last year a tour program of the school was arranged that included the animal-care department. The student groups ranged from high school students to youngsters 9 or 10 years old. We found that children of all ages spent more time in the animal quarters than anywhere else on the campus. During the past year more than 1,000 students toured our facilities. The animal-care department received a number of letters of thanks, not only from teachers and scout group leaders, but from the children themselves.

It is probable that in the years to come these youngsters will have a better understanding of the use of animals in scientific research. They will be less likely to be influenced by nonsensical anti-vivisection literature.

A large number of adults also have toured our facilities. Responsible adults always are invited to go into animal surgery if they wish, provided they mask, cap and gown and observe the other sterile precautions. We feel it is important for them to see that our animal surgery suite compares favorably with a human operating room.

The same "open door" policy is practiced at the farm. There are no gates to the driveway. Anyone is free to drive in and take a look for himself. When nothing is hidden it is amazing how much the whole approach to the animal situation is simplified.

On several occasions people have called and said they were sure we had their dog. They were told that it was quite unlikely, but they were welcome to look at dogs in our kennels. After inspecting the animals they were not only satisfied that the school did not actually have their dog, they also were impressed by the fine accommodations provided for dogs at the medical school.

We enrolled some of our breeding-colony dogs in Canine Club Obedience Classes. This not only resulted in well-trained animals for the medical school, but exposed other dog owners in the community to the fine care and treatment the animals get at the medical school.

Also, each year some of the animals are entered in both the county and state fairs and they usually bring back their share of blue ribbons.

At our invitation, the director of Portland's Humane Society and the mayor's administrative assistant spent a half a day in the animal quarters. This visit resulted in a good working relationship between the Humane Society and the animal care people of the medical school. Although the city ordinance still prevents the medical school from getting dogs from the Portland pound, the director of animal care was recently consulted by the mayor's office when a committee was working on a new ordinance to insure proper transportation and care of animals in pet shops and retail establishments.

Although the animal information program is far from completed here are some of the results to date.

1. More animals are being donated.
2. The public knows of the variety of animals now used in medical research.
3. Recruitment of good animal care personnel has been possible.
4. The faculty is pleased with changing public attitudes toward use of animals.
5. Our 2,000 employees show an increased pride in our animal care facilities and are telling their friends in no uncertain terms that research animals are not mistreated.
6. Because of the far-reaching implications which are involved for all institutions of higher education in America, we presented a summary of this public relations program in national competition of the American College Public Relations Association. We were pleased that it won first prize for distinguished achievement in a public relations project. However, we feel that the real value of entering the competition was to make other universities and colleges aware that research animals need not be a taboo topic but rather a subject that should be and can be explained to the public.

It is believed that great progress has been made since this program was started. But it is going to take the work of more than one institution in the Pacific northwest to gain national public understanding and support of the use of animals in scientific research.

Advances in public understanding have been made. It is hoped that other medical school people will talk to their public relations office and initiate an appropriate information program.

If you sincerely believe that an information program such as is underway at the University of Oregon Medical School will not work in your area, perhaps you should look over your operation with a supercritical eye. If you have decent facilities and you are doing a good job, you should have nothing to hide from the public.

If acceptable facilities are not available, or if animals are not cared for properly, this not only presents a potentially dangerous

public relations problem to an institution, but a real headache to faculty and researchers who must have healthy animals if the results of their investigations are to be valid.

If you unlock your doors and tell the people, in the long run you are going to make your job easier. You are going to gain support for the use of animals in research, and you will discourage undue legislative controls over the use of animals.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduced the Humane Laboratory Animal Treatment Act of 1966, S. 3218, patterned after legislation suggested by the New York State Society for Medical Research, which seeks the same objectives as the bill now before us which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is discussing.

I am glad to see the pending bill before the Senate and, of course, I support it.

I do have one question. The fact is that the bill does leave to the researcher himself the decision as to when the animal is for experimental purposes. As we know, there are also big institutions, foundations, research agencies, and hospitals involved. The view of the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] is very impressive on this point.

Can the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] assure us that at least the Department of Agriculture will make itself helpful to agencies charged with this decision; that we will see to that through legislative oversight; and that if there is coordination necessary with HEW for medical and research decisions the Department of Agriculture will seek that kind of coordination?

Mr. MONRONEY. Certainly, in my mind there is no danger that any researcher is going to say that an animal is always undergoing research when he is in the research facility. They do know, as we know, that there are long periods of time when animals are undergoing research, and that they should be completely exempted from any interference by the Department of Agriculture, or any supervisory group.

For this reason, we wrote it twice in the bill to make certain that it was not overlooked. We would be happy to urge the Department of Agriculture to supply advice in an area where they have no room to operate, so that the people will be certain that the exemption means exactly what it says, that we do not interfere with research. In following out our oversight responsibilities in the Committee on Commerce, we will be careful to look into the results of this legislation as it applies to our research facilities.

Mr. JAVITS. They should also consult with HEW, the private scientific researchers, and the humane societies, in order to get as much guidance as possible.

Mr. MONRONEY. Section 13(a) of the bill states:

SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary shall consult and cooperate with other Federal departments, agencies, or instrumentalities concerned with the welfare of animals used

for research or experimentation when establishing standards pursuant to section 7 and in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

THE REMOVAL OF A RESTRICTION ON CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY HERETOFORE CONVEYED TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1582) to remove a restriction on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2:20 o'clock p.m. having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the Senate will proceed to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader and the acting minority leader if I may propound a unanimous-consent request, to postpone the vote until 2:35 o'clock p.m. on the Morro Rock matter. I do this out of consideration for one of the Senators from California whom I have just left, both of us having important engagements downtown. He was to make a speech. I believe that inasmuch as he is now on his way to the Capitol, I do not think the Senate would like to have a yea-and-nay vote without his presence in the Chamber because of his great interest in this subject.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have no objection whatsoever.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I fully agree with the distinguished Senator from Washington and the acting minority leader. I believe that this may discommode other Senators but, under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Morse amendment take place at 2:35 o'clock p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DOGS AND CATS USED IN RESEARCH

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill [H.R. 13881] to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment and send it to the desk. It would delete certain language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 10, line 18, after "District of Columbia", to strike out the comma and "or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do this because the Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was concerned about the inclusion of the internal commerce of Puerto Rico in the bill. He states that such a regu-

lation of Puerto Rican internal commerce would violate the compact between the United States and Puerto Rico and should, therefore, be deleted from the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, requesting the amendment be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 21, 1966.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Commerce Committee,
Room 5202, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to call your attention to a matter of immediate concern to me. In the form reported by your Committee, H.R. 13881 authorizes the regulation of the commerce of dogs and cats "within . . . the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico." The House-passed version did not so impose upon the internal commerce of Puerto Rico.

As I explained to you in my recent letter concerning the proposed Hartke-Mackay Amendment to the Traffic Safety Act, regulation of the internal commerce of Puerto Rico by the United States Government would be a direct violation of the 1952 compact, between the United States and Puerto Rico, which created the Commonwealth.

A member of my staff discussed this problem today with Mr. Donald Cole, and was informed that this error probably originated in the office of the Senate Legislative Council. Mr. Cole suggested that it be corrected by a Floor amendment, when the bill is considered by the Senate.

I would appreciate it very much if you would offer the enclosed amendment to remedy this situation.

Sincerely yours,
SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, since this does violate the compact, I believe that we should all agree it be deleted from the bill, and urge adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment of the Senator from Washington.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the painful plight of animals used in medical research has been a topic of controversy for many years. Ninety years ago, the British Parliament enacted the Cruelty to Animals Act which provided for minimum standards of care and comfortable housing of research animals. During the past decade, numerous bills have been introduced in both Houses of Congress attempting to remedy the situation in this country.

These proposals have been the source of continuous struggle between humane societies and medical research facilities. Perhaps the problem has remained unsolved because both sides have been so unwilling to compromise. This is a highly complicated and emotionally charged issue. Both the humane groups and the research community have had divisions among their own ranks.

We are all aware that without the use of living animals in research the tremendous advances in medical knowledge of the past few decades could not have occurred. Medical experimentation is necessarily painful sometimes. Researchers are properly afraid of any legislation or control that would restrict or inhibit the necessary surgical or other medical experiments that they must perform on animals if the life sciences are to continue to advance.

Something can be done, however, without interfering with research, to insure that laboratory animals are provided decent, humane care before and after the period of actual experimentation.

For too long the housing, care, and feeding of research animals has been neglected in many of our research institutions and medical colleges. The great emphasis on medical and other research in the life sciences of the last several years has left little time, it seems, to provide for the animals who make most of these activities possible. In some instances, only unskilled attendants or careless part-time workers have been to blame. But inadequate facilities for the care of research animals and callous disregard for even the fundamental principles of cleanliness and comfort on the part of some supervisory officials, have caused the necessary laboratory suffering to be compounded many times.

Often our finest research centers with the very best in laboratory equipment utilize ill-kept basements, cramped inside rooms, or ramshackle wooden out-buildings to house the animals they use. Few of our research institutions provide outside exercise pens so these animals can have proper exercise, sunshine, and fresh air.

The committee heard of many heart-breaking examples. Cages large enough for a dog to stand or lie down in comfortably are often not available. The chance of saving a few cents on cleaning often leads to wire flooring in cages that cuts the dogs' feet. Even such an elementary service as fresh water for the animals is frequently neglected.

The details of the testimony concerning the inhumane treatment of research animals are not pleasant. The pitiful conditions that exist in some animal detention rooms never come to public attention because these rooms are seldom available for public inspection. The sights, sounds, and smells that emanate from them are often repugnant and offensive.

But not always are the animals caged within these rooms allowed to cry out in protest. Dogs used in research sometimes are "debarked"—surgically made voiceless so that their protests cannot be heard.

The details that appear in the committee record reflect very poorly upon a nation so affluent that it now can spend \$1.9 billion annually on medical research. Unsavory and repulsive as they are, I feel that some of the facts brought out in these hearings must be mentioned in connection with this legislation.

Repeated testimony in the hearings

cited cases of malnutrition and extreme restraint and confinement in animal quarters. Witnesses described one laboratory after another where dogs were caged in tiers or stacks of cages. Some of these cages have no floors other than the wire mesh.

The committee was told about research dogs which had had internal organs removed or altered but which had been returned to cages where no comfortable resting place was available. The committee was advised that the wounds resulting from surgical experiments had, in some instances, become infected because of poor maintenance of confinement kennels—or cages, as the case might be.

In one large university hospital, large German Shepherd dogs were found stuffed into cages that were far too small. This was not part of an experiment involving physical restraint. The dogs simply had been mistreated, carelessly placed in cages designed, apparently, for toy breeds, or for rabbits.

Cases were reported of animals being allowed to starve, either because the food supplied them was miserably inadequate or their food needs simply neglected.

I hesitate to go on with gruesome details. I hesitate to mention that in one research facility the bodies of monkeys that had been dead for possibly a week were found in a neglected confinement area.

I could go on and cite one case after another of cramped and inadequate quarters, poor and inadequate food, pitiful animals suffering from infections not related to research but resulting from carelessness and neglect.

Let me make it crystal clear that this bill in no way will impair the rights of researchers and the managers of research facilities to subject animals to medical or surgical procedures required for research and experimentation. It spells out adequate safeguards that medical research will not be impaired. It specifically exempts from regulation those procedures required during actual experimentation. Section 7 and section 17 of the bill both state:

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary to promulgate rules, regulations, or orders for the handling, care, treatment, or inspection of animals during actual research or experimentation by a research facility as determined by such research facility.

The researcher is left completely free to use an animal in his research project in whatever way, no matter how painful, and for as long as he deems necessary, including removing any organs or vital parts, or even experimentation that he knows will result in the death of the animal.

The original provision that was in the bill to license research facilities has been deleted and, hence, there is no question of revocation or suspension of licenses. The most severe penalty is the right of the Federal court to issue a cease and desist order which merely directs the institution to correct the situation in its animal quarters.

In summary, the provisions regulating research facilities provide the following:

First. Prohibit research facilities from buying animals from an unlicensed dealer.

Second. Require research facilities to register with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Third. Direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum standards for the humane handling, care, treatment, and transportation of animals by research facilities, exempting periods of actual research.

Fourth. Direct the Secretary of Agriculture to consult with other Federal agencies concerned with the welfare of research animals, including HEW.

Fifth. Allow inspectors to confiscate or destroy postresearch animals found suffering because of violations of the act. The committee report limits this to animals whose use in experimentation has been completed and which are suffering because of the lack of humane care while in their postoperative condition.

Sixth. That in case of a violation by a research facility the Secretary of Agriculture could issue a complaint to the offending facility and they would have 20 days in which to comply. If the facility failed to comply, the Secretary could then seek a cease and desist order in Federal court.

Seventh. The research facility has 6 months after promulgation to comply with the regulations and the Secretary can grant extensions of time for compliance if he determines the research facility will meet the standards within a reasonable time.

Eighth. The application of these provisions is narrowed to those facilities purchasing or transporting dogs or cats in commerce or which receive Federal grants for research involving animals. This limits the application only the 2,000 largest facilities and excludes the thousands of hospitals, clinics, and schools which use other animals such as mice, rats, and hamsters for research and tests.

These provisions clearly do not interfere with research otherwise I would not have put them in the bill. I have always been an advocate of medical research. I proposed the original amendment establishing the 50-50 matching for the construction of research facilities. My goal here is only to eliminate the unnecessary suffering of these animals.

The objection has been raised that research facilities do not have the necessary funds available to bring their animal quarters up to proper standards. This objection is raised by institutions now receiving more than \$1 billion annually from the Federal Government for research, most of which involves animals. Certainly, the cost of providing decent animal facilities would be a small fraction of the total research expenditures. The bill carefully allows for extensions of time for research facilities to comply with the standards.

Another objection that has been raised is that the regulation of animal care and housing in research laboratories should be carried out by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare rather than the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture, with its

well-established inspection service and its experts in the field of animal husbandry, is ideally suited for the task. Agriculture conducts programs in research related to animal diseases, and it presently administers laws regarding the humane slaughter and treatment of livestock, and the 28-hour law to prevent cruelty to animals in interstate transit.

HEW, on the other hand, has failed in the past to require decent standards of animal care of research institutions receiving millions of dollars in NIH grants. HEW has implied that they would farm out the regulatory authority to the American Association of Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care, a group formed by the American Medical Association and several other medical bodies. This group would make an initial accreditation of animal facilities and then reevaluate them every 5 years.

The American Association of Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care seems hardly adequate to the problem, especially since the inspectors would be drawn from the same scientific community involved in being inspected, a situation where there would be no serious impartiality.

The reason Federal legislation is needed in the first place is the shocking failure of self-policing by the medical community.

Again, I want to emphasize that this bill will not interfere with, restrict, or inhibit research or experimentation in any way. Its objective is merely to provide protection from unnecessary suffering to all laboratory animals in the hands of animal dealers, in transit, and in the laboratory. The bill provides for reasonable reform. I believe it will prove to be beneficial to the research institutions for it will insure them a supply of healthy animals with which to carry out their important mission.

It is commonsense that the use and even reuse of weak, infected, and injured animals can only lead to high mortality rates and inaccurate or even misleading conclusions, and waste of time and money.

Mr. President, we are respected throughout the world not only because our Nation is rich and powerful—but also because we are humane. Life is precious to us—we abhor needless pain and suffering.

This emphasis on humanity is typified by our treatment of animals. The "bad guy" is best caricatured as an ill-tempered citizen who vents his spleen by kicking his dog—and we have a special contempt for such acts.

Some 5 million animals are used each year in U.S. research. This bill will bring our treatment of these animals up to a level in keeping with the high standards we apply to all aspects of our national life.

Mr. President, I believe that Senators are now ready to vote on this vital matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, today, we have an opportunity to take an important step in insuring that the vast

number of animals used in our vital medical research programs are neither stolen nor abused.

Since last summer, the public has been aroused by the press reports of stolen dogs and cats being sold to dealers who, in turn, sell them to research institutions. In addition, there have been many instances uncovered where dealers in these animals have subjected their animals to cruel and inhumane conditions. And even after these animals reach the research institution, conditions for their care and housing are often, in the words of one noted medical researcher, less than desirable.

H.R. 13881, as amended by the committee, recognizes the need for Federal legislation to deal with the abuses that have developed as a result of the Nation's vast program of medical research. Much of this medical research involves experiments and tests with animals. The demand for research animals has risen to such proportions that a system of unregulated dealers is now supplying hundreds of thousands of dogs, cats, and other animals to research facilities each year.

The committee held 3 days of hearings on the subject of regulating those who sell, transport, or handle animals intended for use in medical research. During these hearings, shocking testimony was received concerning the existence of pet stealing operations which supply some animals eventually used by many research institutions. Stolen pets are quickly transported across State lines, changing hands rapidly, and often passing through animal auctions. While in the hands of dealers, these animals are faced with inhumane conditions. Quarters are cramped, uncomfortable, and unsanitary, with inadequate provisions for food and water.

The public has been aroused by exposés of pet theft and the treatment encountered by many of these animals on their way to the medical laboratory. Yet, State laws have proved inadequate both in the apprehending and conviction of the thieves who operate in this interstate operation and in providing for adequate conditions within dealer premises.

Much of the responsibility for creating this huge demand for medical research animals rests with the Federal Government. Grants to research institutions for biomedical research have multiplied twelvefold since the early 1950's. H.R. 13881, as amended, provides a mechanism that will block the existing interstate trade in stolen pets and at the same time will insure humane treatment of those animals which are destined for use in research facilities.

However, it is not just the animal on the way to the laboratory that is faced with inadequate care and treatment. The committee hearings disclosed that shortcomings existed in the care and housing that animals receive after arriving in many medical research laboratories. Cramped quarters and inadequate care are often present, especially in the older research institutions.

H.R. 13881, as amended by the committee, also recognizes the need for upgrading animal standards in the laboratory, but at the same time provides ade-

quate safeguards to insure that medical research will not be impaired. While all witnesses before the committee recognized the need for improving care and housing in the research laboratory, contradictory testimony was received on the question of whether this problem was a responsibility for the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. After lengthy consideration, including an extra day of hearings on the specific issue, it was the committee's determination that the Department of Agriculture was the proper agency for regulating care and housing in the laboratory. However, the committee was very careful to provide protection for the researcher in this matter by exempting from regulation all animals during actual research or experimentation, as opposed to the pre- and post-research treatment. It was not the intention of the committee to interfere in any way with research or experimentation.

Mr. President, the growing traffic in stolen pets and the inhumane treatment that animals receive at the hands of dealers has generated a public outcry rarely experienced by Members of Congress. The members of the Committee on Commerce have received tens of thousands of letters demanding action. Newspapers and magazines throughout the Nation have devoted many editorials to this problem. It is now time for the Senate to act.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CLARK. As the Senator well knows, I strongly support the bill. However, I have discovered—somewhat to my surprise—that the record has not been printed. If we are going to have a yeand-nay vote, we may have to go to conference, and I would therefore urge the chairman of the committee to see that the staff has the record printed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We will. It is on its way over right now. We just did not have it here to put on Senators' desks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I want to commend the Senator from Washington, and others on the committee which brought forth this bill. It is a long overdue bill and a sound one, and I am proud to associate myself with it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

PROTECT OUR PETS FROM THEFT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I support H.R. 13881, as amended by the Committee on Commerce. This legislation, which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended for use in research and experimentation, is a good step in the direction of eliminating the increasing evil trade in stolen pets. This Nation's families

should be protected from dog and cat thieves who steal the family's cherished pet, to sell those pets by the pound or at auction.

This bill strikes at the dog and cat stealers and those who work and cooperate with them by authorizing licensing of animal dealers, prohibiting research facilities from buying from unlicensed dealers, and by directing the Secretary of Agriculture to issue regulations concerning the care, handling, and treatment of the animals they have.

Humane treatment of animals in the hands of dealers and research facilities is furthered by those parts of the law requiring that animals be marked in a humane fashion, that they be humanely treated during auction sale, and that inspectors can confiscate or destroy animals found suffering because of violations of the act.

Particularly helpful to families whose pets are stolen are provisions which facilitate the recovery of stolen pets: law enforcement officials are allowed to inspect the facilities of dealers and research facilities in search of lost animals, and the dogs and cats may not be disposed of for 5 business days after the animal has been acquired by the dealer.

Mr. President, I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, this is an extremely important bill—one of the very important legislative proposals that we shall have before us this year. I hope it will pass in the Senate by unanimous vote. It gives me pleasure to report, Mr. President, that when the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] introduced the first bill providing for humane treatment of experimental animals I was recorded as cosponsor. I spoke out at that time and at times since in this Chamber in support of this meritorious and needed legislative proposal.

This legislative proposal should effectively deter the inhumane treatment of animals by unscrupulous dealers who heretofore have toured the countryside picking up stray dogs and cats and selling them to animal concentration camps. It also provides for humane treatment of these animals when they arrive at experimental laboratories and institutions. In that regard the amendments by the Committee on Commerce to this bill have done much to strengthen it and to make it really effective legislation.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that in the future additional legislation will be enacted which will assure that when essential experiments are conducted animals such as dogs and cats will be subjected to a minimum of torture, as provided in the bill, S. 1071, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. That bill is so important and so greatly needed I hope that later this year or early in the next congressional session it will be further considered in committee and reported to the Senate for debate and vote.

Mr. President, subjecting animals to needless suffering does nothing to advance science or human welfare, and a nation as idealistic in tradition and as great in resources as ours should not tolerate any unnecessary inhumane

treatment of animals used in experiments. Such humane legislation will in no way deter the advancement of medical science. To the contrary, it will eliminate needless brutality.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as the sponsor of what I believe was the first bill in the Senate to provide for the humane treatment of laboratory animals, I am very glad to support today, H.R. 13881.

Six years ago, when I was a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I introduced S. 3570, the purpose of which was to assure the humane treatment of animals used in federally financed research, in which Senators CLARK, MANSFIELD, BARTLETT, BYRD of West Virginia, KEFAUVER, MORSE, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, GRUENING, and McNAMARA joined as sponsors. But, no hearings were ever held on the bill by the Labor Committee, I assume, because of the severe attacks upon it by some researchers, and by some groups who wanted to stop all research. And the only opportunity we had at that time to direct public attention to this matter was on the Senate floor, as when Senator MORSE and I discussed the problem and the need for hearings in February of 1961. Although no action was taken by the committee or the Congress at that time, I feel that the introduction of that bill did stimulate voluntary steps by medical schools, hospitals, and laboratories to care for the animals they use for research.

Other legislation has been introduced in the intervening years, including in this Congress, S. 1071 by Senator CLARK, and S. 1087 by Mrs. NEUBERGER, to authorize the Surgeon General to establish minimum standards for the humane care and treatment of research animals. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held hearings last year on H.R. 5191, introduced by Congressman ROYBAL, to authorize the Surgeon General to support grant programs relating to the care of laboratory animals and to establish standards of care and treatment, and set up an advisory committee to prepare a biennial report to the Congress on the status of laboratory animal care. Many Kentucky doctors wrote to me in support of the Roybal bill, and I agree that its proposals were well directed toward the root of the problem. Also, last year, the House Committee on Agriculture held hearings on the bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for research or experimentation, and this is the bill which was passed by the House and which concerns us today. I am glad to support H.R. 13881 as amended by the Senate Commerce Committee.

I note that in its report to the Senate, the Commerce Committee called attention to the need for the appropriate committees in the Congress "to consider the desirability of additional aid to research facilities for animal quarters in the future." It is clear that the stealing of pets, which causes much pain and heartbreak, should be stopped. It is also clear that this traffic in pets may be caused

by the large demand for animals to be used in medical research and to train doctors, and by the lack of facilities for the large-scale production of high-quality standardized laboratory animals. Research and experimentation utilizing animals must go on, and I hope the Senate Labor Committee will now go on to hold hearings on S. 3332, introduced last month by Senator HILL, to provide financial assistance for the construction of better and proper laboratory animal facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 18, 1960, and February 6, 1961, be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 18, 1960]

HUMANE TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN ANIMALS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators MANSFIELD, BARTLETT, BYRD of West Virginia, Kefauver, MORSE, PROXMIER, RANDOLPH, GRUENING, McNAMARA, and CLARK, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide for the humane treatment of animals used in experiments by recipients of grants from the United States, and by departments and agencies of the Government.

I am aware that there are those who have raised objection to this proposal. Yet it seems to me that the objectives of the bill are such that they are entitled to be considered by the appropriate committees of the Congress. I do not say that the language is perfect or that every approach is necessarily the proper one. Certainly, the objectives of the bill are worth while, and it merits earnest attention.

I am informed that this bill would not inhibit or prevent experimental research. Nor is it my intention or that of the cosponsors of this bill to do so. Its basic goal is to insure that in experiments requiring the use of animals, precautions will be taken and every effort will be made to conduct such experiments in a manner that is as humane as possible.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 5 days so that other Senators who wish to join in sponsoring the bill may have the opportunity to do so.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 6, 1961]

RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR TREATMENT OF EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS BY RESEARCH GROUPS RECEIVING FEDERAL RESEARCH FUNDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last year the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] introduced a bill, numbered S. 3570, of which I was happy to be on the cosponsors. The bill provided some rules and regulations for the treatment of experimental animals by research groups receiving Federal research funds.

The bill was subsequently attacked very strongly by medical research organizations and many persons in the medical profession. Last fall there appeared in Science magazine a letter from Prof. Bradley T. Scheer, chairman of the department of biology at the University of Oregon, in which he made what I regard as a very sound and worthwhile analysis of the bill and its purpose. I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Scheer's letter to Science magazine printed at this point in the RECORD, for the information of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"The bill S. 3570 recently introduced into the Senate by Senator COOPER and others, 'to provide for the humane treatment of animals,' has been strongly attacked both in Science [132, 7 (1960)] and in the Bulletin of the National Society for Medical Research. These attacks have given what I think to be a false idea of the nature and intent of the bill, and of the motives of its sponsors, and prompt me to make a carefully considered statement of my own opinion.

"The issue of humane treatment itself is a moral one: To what extent are we justified in inflicting pain and discomfort on other organisms in our search for knowledge? Bill S. 3570 takes the position 'that living vertebrate animals used for scientific experiments shall be spared unnecessary pain and fear; that they shall be used only when no other feasible and satisfactory methods can be used to ascertain biological and scientific information for the cure of disease, alleviation of suffering, prolongation of life, or for military requirements; and that all such animals shall be comfortably housed, well fed, and humanely handled.' This is a statement with which, I think, most biologists would agree in principle; personally I should feel more comfortable if the words 'potentially valuable' were inserted after the words 'scientific information,' but I think that the efforts of the National Society for Medical Research, the Animal Care Panel, and the American Physiological Society over the past several years have been directed toward the general aims stated above.

"The second issue posed by the bill is a practical political one: Granted that humane treatment is desirable, is legislation, and in particular this legislation, the best means to assure it? The alternatives would seem to be voluntary action by the investigators or local control by individual communities. The charges recently brought against Stanford University and the College of Medical Evangelists in California show that local action under the influence of extremist pressure groups may still endanger medical research; it seems probable that the existence of Federal legislation of the type proposed in S. 3570 would do much to protect laboratories against this sort of local attack. The question of voluntary action is a more debatable one. In my own experience I have never come across an instance of wanton cruelty to experimental animals, but I have encountered numerous cases of neglect due to callousness, inadequate facilities, inexperience, or carelessness; again, it would seem that S. 3570 would help to eliminate such instances.

"The reasonable objections which have been made to the specific provisions of S. 3570 are well summarized in the Science editorial: 'Advanced approval of experimental plans by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, burdensome recordkeeping, annual or more frequent reports to HEW, additional costs and a new and unnecessary amount of redtape.' As I read the bill, it seems to me that the requirements are not greatly beyond those now in force. Every application for Federal research funds requires submission of an experimental plan which is approved by a panel of scientists. I hope that all of us who publish results of animal experiments do at least the amount of recordkeeping specified by the bill. Every Federal research grant now requires an annual report. The only additional features are that the experimental plan must specify what animals are to be used and what type of experiments are to be performed; there is nothing in the bill requiring advance approval of every minor change in experimental procedure. The report, also, must specify the animals used and the procedures employed, but there is nothing in the bill to say that this must coincide exactly with the plan proposed. Compliance with the provisions of the bill will cost more, insofar as the existing laboratories do not provide adequate facili-

ties for the animals used, but this should result in better experimental results as well as more humane care.

"The National Society for Medical Research has devoted much attention to the provision for inspection of facilities and for certificates of compliance with regulations to be laid down by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; this is presumably the redtape with which Science is concerned. At present, every institution receiving grants from Federal agencies is visited—or if you wish, inspected—by officers of those agencies. On the basis of past experience, I think that we have nothing to fear from these officers, who have abundantly demonstrated that their main aim is to further research of the highest quality. Any regulations which HEW might lay down under an act of the sort proposed would, I think, not depart from this aim. In any event, the bill gives no police powers to HEW or anyone else, so that work sponsored by any but Federal agencies would not be in any way affected.

"In sum, I cannot find in this bill the evils which the National Society for Medical Research or Science profess to see, and I would urge my colleagues who are interested in animal experimentation, humane treatment, or both, to read the bill with care, to make their own appraisals on the basis of their own judgments, and to communicate these judgments to their representatives in the Congress.

"BRADLEY T. SCHEER."

Mr. MORSE. I do not know whether or not the Senator from Kentucky contemplates reintroducing his bill at a later time in this session. I shall, at a later time, present some information I have received in opposition to the bill in the form in which it was introduced last year.

I feel it is only fair to see to it that the points of view of both the opponents and proponents of the bill are made available for the study of our colleagues in the Senate before any further action is taken on the bill.

I think it is quite possible some of the objections to the bill may lead to a consideration of some modification in the language of the bill, or possible amendment to the bill, in case it is introduced in its original form.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate very much the references made by the Senator from Oregon to the bill I introduced last year. As the Senator will remember, the purpose of the bill was to assure humane treatment of animals used in federally financed research.

After I introduced the bill—and the Senator from Oregon and other Senators joined in introduction of the bill—I was flooded with letters of protest from various sources, many of them from people engaged in research, who made the assertion that the bill, if passed, would very seriously interfere with all such research. Others have said that its hidden purpose is to stop all research with animals.

I have also read the articles that have been appearing in the magazines. I must say that those articles and advertisements, sponsored by the antivivisection society, must have cost a great deal of money. They say, on the contrary, that it is a ruse for actually approving the use of animals for research.

I am not an expert in this subject. It could very well be true that the bill should be modified. I assume it would be the function of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to consider modification when it reaches the committee.

I intend to introduce the bill again. I hope the Senator from Oregon will join me in its introduction. I am sure that most people doing research use humane methods, as has been stated in their letters, and I know it is not the intent of any of the bill's sponsors to interfere with their search in

any way. But there may be some who should not be engaged in research; and if they are using methods which are not humane or necessary, or if animals are neglected in some places prior to their use by qualified researchers, then I think there is a real purpose in the bill.

I was much interested in one article I read only yesterday, which will appear in one of the leading magazines in a short time. It said, commenting on the "dangers" of the bill which I introduced, that it would "torpedo" medical research, that it would "strangle" it.

I assert that the statements which have been made are exaggerated, and most of them are without any foundation at all. I would say some of them have evidently been devoted to preventing any kind of judgment as to what kind of methods are being used.

Research with animals has produced great benefit for humanity and society, as a result of methods which have been developed to treat human disease. I am sure that the lot of animals killed or injured for that purpose is not always pleasant or happy or without pain. Surely, if the lives of animals are to be taken for our benefit—to help mankind—standards ought to be established to treat those animals humanely. That is the purpose of the bill.

As I have said, I have no scientific knowledge as to whether the particular provisions of the bill are extreme or whether it should be modified. But I say flatly the purpose of the bill is not in any way to inhibit, frustrate, or interfere with research. It is to encourage research, for the best research is carried out as humanely as possible.

The bill does have a humane purpose. When animals are to be used to save human life or treat disease, surely we can establish methods to give assurance the animals are well treated. If one does not care about life in one form, he may not care about life in any form.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his comments. I shall make available to the Senator from Kentucky the material I am now having a staff member study in connection with this bill, preparatory to submitting recommendations to me as to whether or not he would advise any modification of the language of the bill. As soon as that study is completed, I shall make it available to the Senator from Kentucky.

The purpose of the bill, as stated by the Senator from Kentucky, is exactly the same purpose he stated when the bill was introduced, a purpose of which I approve.

There is no question about the fact that the purpose of the bill is to meet the complaint on the part of some persons within our country who state that research with animals is not conducted in the most humane way possible. It certainly is not unsound or unfair for us to take the position that, consonant with research objectives, these experiments should be carried on in a humane manner. That is all that is sought by the bill; and if that objective can be accomplished with some modification of the bill, so far as I am concerned I would have no quarrel with any amendments.

But I am sure, may I say to the Senator from Kentucky, that he and I are dealing with one of those "hot potatoes," legislatively speaking, in which we are bound to displease some, no matter what course of action we follow. The Senator will recall that last year, or the year before, we finally passed a humane slaughter bill. The proposals that were made by some of those who have very deep feelings about problems of slaughtering were, in my judgment, so extreme that, if we were to comply with the wishes of some of them, all of us would become vegetarians, because to adopt their policy would have involved the closing down of all the slaughterhouses in America. We could not possibly have operated slaughter-

houses in America if we had carried out the proposals that were made in regard to how animals were going to be slaughtered. That is, it would not have been possible to conduct slaughterhouses on the basis of the American free enterprise system; and I would be the first, in this field, as in any other, to oppose nationalization of any segment of our economy, may I say, as a liberal.

So what we tried to do in the slaughterhouse bill was to find an area that answered the question in regard to humane proposals for slaughtering actually being advocated. To the extent that they were followed, we thought they ought to be incorporated in the bill. We passed the bill. Perhaps the Senator from Kentucky or some other Senator has heard of some calamity which has followed the passage of the bill, but I have not heard about any.

Mr. COOPER. No.

Mr. MORSE. I think it has come to be recognized that we did at least a fairly good job in meeting a problem which needed to be met.

The Senator from Kentucky has referred to the antivivisectionists. One of the communications I received in regard to the bill was from a distinguished doctor in this Nation. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky will recognize the name the moment he takes a look at the letter. It was a pretty rough letter on both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Oregon. In fact, it said that we had surrendered to the antivivisectionists.

When someone writes to me in that vein I am inclined to suspect that there is a great big hole in his case, because if he has the evidence and the facts which support his position he does not have to accuse Senators of engaging in some form of surrendering to or "buckling under" to some legislative group in the country.

I replied to the good doctor by pointing out to him that I had always made clear I did not adopt the point of view of the antivivisectionist; but the fact is, as I said, that some of our finest citizens in all the communities of America share the antivivisectionist point of view. They are as sincere as are those who are opposed to their point of view, and as sincere as those of us who feel that our responsibility as legislators is to try to find the middle ground between the antivivisectionists and those who feel that no legislation is regard to humane treatment of animals, in respect to experimentation and laboratory tests, should be passed at all.

I said that I happen to be one who believes it is essential, in the interest of protecting human existence, to make use of animals in experimentation in the medical field, and in endeavors to help us bring to an end some of the great disease scourges which plague mankind, but I also hold to the point of view that there is this much which can be said for the position of the antivivisectionists, although they want to go much further: They are certainly correct in pointing out that if there is any lack of humaneness, if there is any unnecessary suffering and cruelty inflicted upon animals in the carrying out of experiments, then it is necessary to devise proper controls and improvements in laboratory techniques to keep the suffering to a minimum.

I shall discuss this matter at greater length later, when I bring to the Senate the study I am having made by a staff member.

Let the RECORD show that the senior Senator from Oregon is not going to support the extreme position taken by the antivivisectionists, which, when all is said and done, would have the effect of saying, "Pass legislation which stops the use of animals in this whole matter of experimentation in the laboratories which are seeking to carry on investigations to solve some of the great disease problems which plague mankind."

That is the position I take. I should like to confer with the Senator from Kentucky in the next few days about his bill, before he introduces it, if he thinks it is feasible to wait for that period of time.

Mr. COOPER. I will be glad to do so, and I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Oregon.

I am not an antivivisectionist, and of course I do not adhere to that point of view. I know we have to have experiments and we have to use animals in these experiments.

I am sure that in most places over the country those who are engaged in these experiments observe, as best they can, humane procedures, but the charge is made that some do not.

Even to have the bill introduced, to bring it before the committee, and to allow hearings to be held upon it, will certainly establish whether any law is needed. If none is needed, the committee can decide the point. If the bill which I have introduced is not proper for the purposes we both seek, the committee can make whatever modifications are necessary. I have served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I know it is a good committee.

I have received letters from deans of medical colleges and universities which have said flatly the bill would stop all research. After I had written to them expaining the purposes of the proposal, I have also received letters from several which said, "We think it is all right. Let the matter be heard."

I know this much about the Senator from Oregon—he is not afraid of any outcry which may be raised about a bill before it has even been discussed and considered by a committee. I know he knows I am not.

Let the matter be heard. I agree with the Senator. I remember the situation which occurred when the humane slaughter bill was introduced. A great outcry was heard all over the country, that the passage of such legislation would stop the processing and distribution of food. It was claimed that passage of such legislation would put people out of business, especially the small packers, and that it was a move to help the great packing industry—although that part of the industry was not in favor of the proposed legislation either and fought it. The Senator remembers that. It took about 2 years to pass the bill.

Finally, a reasonable bill was passed. I have asked what has happened since then. I have learned that the Department of Agriculture has already secured 87 percent compliance in this field, and secured that in less than half a year that the act has been in force.

I am sure the Senator also remembers a bill which was called the wild horse bill. I always liked the title. Although I am from Kentucky, which is a horse State, when the bill was first brought to my attention, I was puzzled by its reference to wild horses. I learned that there was a problem in the West in regard to catching wild horses. I think the horses were being chased by airplanes, and various inhumane ways were used to capture them.

That bill was fought. It was said that it was necessary to do the things being done to capture the horses. The committee considered the bill. The Congress passed the bill. I do not believe it has ruined the wild horse industry.

The Senator is a horseman, and can tell me about the subject.

Mr. MORSE. It might have increased the cost of dog meat a little bit, but that was probably either necessary or desirable.

Mr. COOPER. I am very happy to have the Senator's contribution.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from Kentucky that in answering the distinguished doctor I took the liberty of stating it was my position—and I was sure it was the position of the Senator from Kentucky—that

when the hearings were held on the bill, if evidence could be brought forth that the bill needed either modification or defeat the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Kentucky would follow where the evidence led, but that the proponents of the bill, being responsible citizens of this country, had a right to petition their Government for consideration of the subject matter of the bill, and that right alone justified the introduction of a bill for hearings, as the Senator from Kentucky has indicated this afternoon.

I happen to be a member of the committee to which the Senator refers. If the bill is introduced and is referred to our committee for hearings, I will see to it that all sides of the question receive a full and adequate hearing, so that they can present their evidence in support of their respective positions.

Mr. COOPER. I hope the bill will be referred to the subcommittee of which the Senator is chairman. I had the honor of serving with the Senator from Oregon on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for 5 years. I served on a subcommittee with him, and remember very well one bill which we considered for 2 years, the Railway Labor Act. Whatever agreement or disagreement others may have with the Senator from Oregon—and we all differ at times with each other on various subjects—I may say that I never saw a chairman of a committee or of a subcommittee who took more pains to give everyone on both sides a chance to be heard, to hear the evidence, and then to consider the evidence submitted and work out bills properly based on that evidence, than did the Senator from Oregon. I know his conscientious methods from intimate association with him on committees, and I am glad to have the opportunity to tell what I have observed during my various terms in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Kentucky is very kind and gracious. His leaving the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is a great loss to the committee, and I wish I had the power of suasion which would induce him to return to the committee, because I would very much like to have him on the committee again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment as amended, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announced that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ala-

bama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 106 Leg.]

YEAS—85

Aiken	Gruening	Morse
Allott	Hart	Morton
Anderson	Hartke	Moss
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Bayh	Hill	Muskie
Bennett	Holland	Neuberger
Bible	Hruska	Pastore
Boggs	Inouye	Pearson
Burdick	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Carlson	Kennedy, Mass.	Robertson
Church	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell, Ga.
Clark	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Cooper	Lausche	Scott
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Smith
Dickens	Long, La.	Stennis
Dodd	Magnuson	Symington
Dominick	Mansfield	Talmadge
Douglas	McCarthy	Thurmond
Eastland	McGee	Tower
Ellender	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Fannin	Metcalf	Yarborough
Fong	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Mondale	Young, Ohio
Gore	Monroney	
Griffin	Montoya	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—15

Bass	Hayden	Russell, S.C.
Brewster	McClellan	Simpson
Case	Mundt	Smathers
Curtis	Nelson	Sparkman
Harris	Proutty	Tydings

So the bill (H.R. 13881) was passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and certain other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate's unanimous passage of this measure which is designed to protect our Nation's dogs, cats and other animals is another great tribute to the able and

effective leadership of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. A success of this magnitude could be achieved only with his strong and articulate advocacy. Once again the Senate and the Nation owe him a debt of sincere gratitude for his unmatched skill and devotion.

Equally in the debt of the Senate and the Nation today for the outstanding success of this measure, is the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE]. His able efforts have been behind the bill throughout its history in this body. His capable leadership and articulate advocacy assured its unanimous endorsement by the Senate today.

As is so often the case, many other Senators played vital roles in helping to accomplish this achievement. The highly able support and cooperation of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] was indispensable to its overwhelming acceptance. Similarly, both of the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT] were characteristically most articulate in their support, as was the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Finally, to the Senate as a whole I personally am deeply grateful for the highly efficient and orderly disposition of the bill. Its great success is a tribute to this entire body.

THE REMOVAL OF A RESTRICTION ON CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY HERETOFORE CONVEYED TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1582) to remove a restriction on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now proceed to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the bill (H.R. 1582). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.